DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 184 EA 011 462

AUTHOR Lynch, Patrick D.
TITLE Introduction to a Comparative Study of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 79
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, Calif., April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Comparative Analysis; *Comparative Education; Cross Cultural Studies; Economics; *Educational Administration; Educational Economics; Educational History; Educational Philosophy
IDENTIFIERS Position Papers

ABSTRACT

Comparative educational administration is not yet a recognized field, although a number of works concerning cross-cultural educational literature are directly applicable to such studies. Four themes are apparent in relevant works. Beginning in the 19th century, the earliest works focused on European schools in the hopes America could learn from the European systems. The second period of literature was marked by comparative works ranging from analyses of cultural and political barriers and structural-functional descriptions. In the post-World War II period, American educators concentrated on how to import democratic ideals to formerly totalitarian systems. At present, the literature of comparative inquiry is dominated by economics, including rate of return studies, and studies concerning the consequences of structured economic relationships. Comparative educational administration lacks the literature base found in the fields of comparative law, public administration, or political science. The time is overdue for a comparative approach to the study of educational administration. The role of administrators can be studied in conjunction with such issues as the nature and effects of schooling, preserving cultural integrity, the viability of rural areas, the role of education in national development, the responsiveness of educational bureaucracies, and change models. Tools to be used in this field are social and philosophical analysis and knowledge about cultural imperatives. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168184

INTRODUCTION TO A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

by Patrick D. Lynch

Comparative educational administration is not yet a recognized field in educational administration, but comparative education has a respectable history. The human area relations files contain descriptions of the means employed by a culture to induct its young and socialize them into that culture. Hans outlined the recent history of comparative education.[1] He quotes Julien who wrote in 1817:

> "Education, as other sciences, is based on facts and observations which should be arranged in analytical tables, easily compared, in order to deduce principles and definite rules. Education should become a positive science instead of being ruled by narrow and limited opinions, by whims and arbitrary opinions of administrators. . . ."[2]

Julien's dream of arranging data to allow easy comparison has encountered problems, not least among which is the difficulty of obtaining comparable and reliable data from each country. A comparative educational administration which is an examination of cross national data to assist the formations of concepts and principles is closer to Julien's notion as a science, and is a starting point for the development of a sub-discipline. Perhaps it might become a social science, much as it depends upon the contributions of the social sciences.

To review briefly the works one might claim as constituting a literature of comparative educational administration, I would suggest the following themes recognizable since the early 19th century as they appear in the United States:

EA 011 462

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Lynch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

1. The earliest works from the second decade of the 19th century to its close, consisted of descriptions of European schools and educational systems. The expressed purpose of many of these comparative analyses was to apply from the European systems practices which would be useful to American schools. These earliest works carried a humility and eagerness to learn which was missing from works of later periods.
2. The second period of the literature was marked by avowedly comparative works. These ranged from analyses of the relationship of cultural and political variables to educational systems, to structural-functional descriptions laid side by side. Kandel was the prime mover of this period, as he was the organizer and philosopher of comparative education in the United States. Works of this type appeared as late as the early 1960's.
3. The post World War II period brought the one-world consciousness to comparative education. Many American educators saw their burden as converting formerly totalitarian educational systems to something more nurturant of democratic ideals. However, the theme of carrying American efficiency to the educational systems of developing countries was dominant by the 1950's. This period of missionary zeal saw the marriage of educational change techniques to American strategic concerns. America's duty to defend the free world included the necessity of exporting American educational models. Outside administrators working in developing countries turned to social science to secure implementation of change through adoption of diffusion models. The models of change-agent-client relationships are very much alive in 1979.

4. Economics dominated this stage of comparative inquiry which continues to the p:esent. The present state of comparative educational administration is dominated by economic theory, but one must distinguish two streams of concern in the period. The first stream signaled by Schultz's paper in 1960, "Investment in Human Capital," was marked by an abundance of rate of return studies.[3] Modern comparative educational administration might well be said to date from this time. The most recent stream, the one in which began in the 1970's, is marked by concern for the consequences of structured economic relationships. The structure of world trade and monetary relationships affecting schooling now receives generous attention. The innocence and confidence of the 1960's in which world poverty would be dissolved by application of rational models have given way to doubts about final success, expressions of guilt for exploitation, even expressions of the need for some kind of revolution against economic dominance.
5. A stage of inquiry concurrent with the preceding is the comparative analysis of processes and outputs of education. I include analyses of formal and nonformal systems. Not altogether independent of the economic emphasis, these studies have had different purposes and were partly inspired by Coleman's 1966 study in the U.S.

What follows are selected examples of the various stages. In no sense is it a review of literature, but an introduction to a conceptual outline for a comparative educational administration. It is easier to mark off the first and second stages in time, as the last three run concurrently, and are distinguishable

by an author's emphasis, however fleeting that might be. The first period of comparison for evaluation is typified by Henry Edwin Dwight's "Education in Prussia and the United States" in 1825. He contrasted Prussia's organization for education of all youth with the Catholic portion of the Germanys in which he found an inferior will to educate. His perception of the preparation of schoolmasters in Prussia was that if ". . . such schoolmasters were provided for the education of the youth of Connecticut, the intellectual character of the mass of the inhabitants would, in one generation not only become superior to that of every other people, but it would become the wonder and admiration of our country."[4]

Woodbridge, in 1832, published a comparative analysis of attendance in common schools to the inhabitants of the country, much like that found in a 1960's type sub-sector analysis of primary education.[5] Horace Mann's Seventh Annual Report included an extract in which he penetratingly related political objectives of European states to their educational efforts. Overall, he was unimpressed by their school systems, even by Prussia's.[6]

James Russell Parsons, writing in the late 19th century, was even more impressed with Prussia than Dwight had been seven decades earlier.[7] Like many Americans in the dawning of America's industrial and managerial revolution, Prussia's efficiency, organization,

and above all, reliable data on nearly every aspect of schooling, conquered him. He agreed with a Frenchman's reporting of 1833, in lyrical terms on the need for France to emulate Prussia's school organization. Parsons praised six features of the Prussian system, among them compulsory education, official courses of study fixing the amount of work to be accomplished in uniform ways for each classroom, the elevation of teaching to a profession, training of all teachers for at least a year, general supervision of instruction for children in private and public schools, and definite qualifications and experience in teaching for the offices of school commissioner. Among the superiorities he noted was the system of rules concerning school discipline, including records of physical punishment. He predicted that "New York elementary schools will never compare favorably with those of Prussia without similar provisions."[8]

The Parsons work was loaded with commentary and description concerning the Prussian administrative structure. It was, more importantly, prophetic for the shape that school administration in America would take. The Prussian model was close to what the founding fathers of educational administration in America in the succeeding two decades would build.

During the 19th century there were corresponding articles by foreigners on American schooling including its administration. Fraser in an official English Report in 1865, praised the efficiency of the American schools.[9] Buisson, in 1876, noted that from the "peculiarity" of local boards, came the "unfortunate influence

of political prejudices and local interests," a "liability to sudden changes in the school organization," and the "Marked taste . . . for innovation."[10] Lanshley made a series of charts comparing administrative characteristics of education in seven countries which are among the most detailed of the 19th century.[11] Hausknecht, a German educator, clucked in an 1893 report over the lack of a national organization for education with widely varying quality, and a "makeshift coeducation."[12] He was not impressed by the ubiquitousness of women teachers in America. E. F. McCarthy provided, in 1895, a structural-functional comparison of English and American administrative and curriculum systems superior in its conceptual power to works of American authors until the 1960's.[13] R. E. Hughes in 1901 provided an extensive analysis of rural and urban educational systems and administrative problems in Great Britain, Germany and the United States.[14]

Many interesting comparative pieces can be found with information on administrative structure and function in the volumes of the American Journal of Education, the first volume of which appeared in 1856, edited by Henry Barnard. In the 1871, for example, articles on school management and buildings in Scotland,[15] and the organization of education in Belgium can be found.[16]

Kandel, as the organizer of comparative education in America, authored many articles and volumes on the discipline and education in various countries. The International Yearbook was edited by Kandel.[17] Beginning in 1924, it was last published in 1943. The articles of the Yearbook

relating to educational administration reflect Kandel's interest in the cultural setting of education, and value orientations ascribed to the various national groups described. Beginning in 1945, UNESCO sponsored a steadily growing number of works providing descriptions and data on educational systems of the world. The International Yearbook of Education is an indispensable source to those requiring systematic information on comparative systems. Among the last works describing various systems in an impressionistic way, with no mentioned concern for the relationship to economic development, is the book Comparative Educational Administration.[18] The authors are well known to us, Reller and Morphet.

The literature of the third stage, of the conversion of the less developed world to American models, or "rational models" seen through American eyes, is abundant. Many national plans for education in nations served by USAID carry assumptions that the faster the nation adopts mass education, the faster it will triumph over poverty, ingnorance, or what-have-you. The exportation of such ideas as the comprehensive high school, the experimental or laboratory school attached to teachers' colleges, the vocational technical school as a separate institution, and the establishment of planning offices within ministries of education were enthusiastically sold to many ministries of education along with the grant or loan funds necessary to establish them. The integration of such artifacts often caused severe problems of administration and financing of those institutions.

The rise of the literature of social change in the 1950's accompanied the concept-export stage. Studies of how to secure acceptance of ideas by clients, involving rates of change, and analysis of change

agent roles abounded. Lippitt's work in 1958 described the techniques of change agents external to the developing nations and their effectiveness.[19]

Concern for spread of the exported practice and widespread adoption of the exported organizational artifact brought social science onto the scene. Planners who sought to get the comprehensive high school, for example, diffused past the pilot stage in the host nation borrowed from the literature of adoption-diffusion, and the voluminous institutional change literature. Beal[20] and his followers began their work in rural sociology and later became necessary references in cross-national work. An important consequence of the employment of the adoption-change agent models in Latin America was the reenforcement by U.S. development agencies of the already strong inclination of many governments to ignore the small, traditional, and "laggard" peasant farmers and to concentrate attention and what few resources existed on the large plantation-type operations. The lack of concern for the small plot owner had serious consequences in the 1970's when it was discovered that they, not the export-oriented plantation owners, fed most of many developing nations. Food imports had to rise as the small farmer abandoned his land, and middle class demand for food increased.[21]

The literature of community studies, coming as it did from sociology and anthropology, was employed less widely in what one might call comparative educational administration papers. But evidence of the notions of "power structures" and "influence networks" became evident in the 1960's as well. Few international comparative types by 1970 were unaware of the Vicos study in Peru.[22]

The impact of economic works in the fourth period is so great that one can truthfully say that comparative educational administration has become an adjunct to the economics of education.

The 1960's ushered in worldwide a massive concern for economic development. The break into the development theme, emphasizing formation of human capital, coincides with the shift in trading advantage in the less developed countries by 1961. By that year the advantage the raw materials exporting nations had enjoyed in the 1950's vis-à-vis the developed countries vanished. From then on the price of capital formation accelerated, the price of raw materials held steady, but if they rose were accompanied by equally steep rises in imports.[23] The 1960's saw the emphasis shift to formation of industrial capital at the expense of the subsistence agriculture sector.[24]

The movement from rate of return and manpower studies to cost of education analyses reflected a growing sophistication in economics of education, but also revealed the confidence economists had in using models which were not fatally compromised by a lack of abundant, reliable data. Correa's book, published in 1975, reviews the economic models used in educational planning and administration.[25] It was designed as a work to enable administrators to examine cross-national educational systems data.

Bowles identified elements of the technology commonly used by planners during the 1960's.[26] These were the employment of input and output analysis, linear programming, and marginal analysis, as well as the models reviewed by Correa. Explicit in Bowles work is the usefulness of national educational planning in the search for optimality.[27] The effectiveness of

nonformal education was subjected to cost analysis, as well as the difficult search for benefit analysis.[28]

The major assumptions of the economists in prescribing changes for the less developed world were discussed by Wildavsky,[29] and Beckford.[30] They are worth listing because of their pervasive influence:

1. The need to modernize, i.e., develop or industrialize.
2. The need for macro planning, moving from national to regional international, and finally worldwide in scope. This required strategies to be identified not by the nations separately but by outside and supranational development agencies.
3. The supremacy of rational models, to be employed as culture-free models. This uncluttered view ignores local, or micro effects. What works in the developed nations will work as well for less developed ones, "all other things being equal."
4. The need to establish a reputation for fiscal responsibility, even at the cost of sacrificing some social goals. This implies the need to satisfy multinational creditors and to delegate to multinational exchange mechanisms, such as corporations, decisions over prices of imports and exports. Playing this game results in a surrender of national options balancing production of food products for the internal market against a few speciality items produced in the plantation (or mine) economy for export, yielding to the latter.
5. The acceptance of economic scarcity for many nations as a long-term condition for the developing nation.

6. The acceptance of outside or supranational agencies' definitions of the less developed nations' problems. Chief among these is population control, which is transformed into a precondition for all other desirable changes. Second is a long delay in achieving social welfare goals for the mass of the poor, others include control of inflation, and so on to perfection in the economic world.
7. Not least is the need to create a body of planners with plenary powers, a bureaucracy at once all powerful and omniscient, pure in motive and skilled in application and faithful to the rational models which are imported.

Turning to the later stage of the economists' view of comparative educational administration, we encounter a dynamic criticism of the efficacy of past methodologies, a humility about the possibility of solving deep-seated problems of poor nations and a lack of optimism concerning the use of rational models. Of greatest import to administrators is the movement to structural analysis of poverty and dependency, and the recognition of the nation itself as the proper decision making arena for fashioning solutions.

Blaming the victim is no longer fashionable. The blame for poor nations' problems has been shifted in the 1970's to the rich, powerful exploiting nation. Rene Dumont's work, as an example of this shift, has been very influential.[31] Carnoy examined Coombs' favorably reviewed book The World Education Crisis,[32] in which the author prescribes technological solutions for increasing efficiency of schooling in developing countries, and criticizes those nations for educating too many academic types, maintaining inefficient school systems with too much wastage through dropouts.

Carnoy in this essay blames the problems instead on the structured dependence of the developing nations on the developed ones.[33]

Theoretical formulations of world economic relationships now include formulations which explain the structure of international economic relations in terms of exploitation, dependency or core-periphery participation.

Dependency theory of which the core-periphery model of Wallerstein is a type, is increasing in complexity as it attracts revisionists. Dependency theory is a group of analytical tools, but cannot be classed with the instrumental methods of economists still so widely used, and which were dominant in the 1960's. The theorists who have constructed dependency theories display a Marxist orientation. As Willower indicates in his 1979 AERA paper, Marxism is a belief structure as well as theory which provides a framework for action.[34]

The worldview of the dependency theorists brings political action onto the field in order to correct economic imbalances between the developed and developing world. Economic solutions without social goals backed by political action are more apt to increase dependency than to bring about release from international economic bondage. Autonomous development is seen as an end which requires rejection by the developing nations of supranational agencies' goals imposed on them as untasty but necessary medicine.

Powerful theorists representing the reformist thinking of the 1970's include Andre Frank who offers historical explanations for structured dependency and underdevelopment.[35] Levin applied correspondence theory which is a variety of dependence theory, the educational sector being dependent on and reflective of class structure, to the United States.[36] Baran was one of the earliest scholars to describe the forcing of less developed

countries into dependent relationships.[37] His work did not gain wide attention until the present decade. The core-periphery model of dependence in which the metropolitan areas of developed and underdeveloped nations form a core of participation, and the rural areas of both constituent peripheral economic areas has provoked widespread attention as well as criticism.[38] A much more simplistic model, school systems used for maintaining colonial relationships, enjoyed a brief and limited popularity.[39]

The fifth stage of literature can only be forced into a systems analysis framework because they might fit there through my logic rather than that of the authors'. The fit is only for purpose of this introduction to a literature review.

Placing Paolo Freire's work as an example of process in the systems analysis frame of reference takes some liberty with the author's intentions. If process, so much neglected by educational planners, or consigned by them to a black box, becomes central to educational planning, it will be so because of Freire. His work, emphasizes affect as an instrument as necessary as skills for the learners to change their society.[40] It has the potential for providing such feedback to setting goals as would give many systems devotees nightmares. The revolution in thinking in the curriculum, which one might call "liberation curriculum," owes its awakening in great art to Freira. The emphasis on opening up the purposes and contents of the curriculum has been influenced by the adult education movement in Latin America.[41]

Turning to comparative studies of output, the series of comparative studies of achievement done by the International Association for the

Evaluation of Educational Achievement stand out as most significant. Begun in 1966, the studies eventually assessed six subject areas in twenty countries, including four less developed nations.[42] The study and many others done as portions of education sector analyses in various countries, follow a line of concern similar to the Coleman Report in the United States in 1966.

Using schooling and work in a factory as independent variables, Inkeles and Smith studied their effects on "modernization." This most important work used sociological tools to compare the influences of types of urban and rural experiences on attitudes toward the community and world in different societies.[43] While Freire, Inkeles, and the IEA studies might seem to be unrelated, they together reflect a growing awareness by scholars that process and outputs of education require examination in many cultural settings in order to test the efficacy and purposes of education.

EDUCATIONAL ALMINISTRATION: A LAGGARD AMONG COMPARATIVE FIELDS

The review above shows the need for a comparative educational administrator to depend upon a wide variety of literature. Recently dominated by economics of education, the field of administration lacks a systematic comprehensive review found in other fields.

One of the oldest comparative fields is law. The comparison of the civil and common law traditions provides deep insights into the practice of administration across societies.[44] So far, virtually no work has been done on the comparative influence of civil and common law on the process of

education or on participants in the system. The rights of students, the obligations of parents, the position of the state on torts, and the obligations and duties of professionals need to be examined in the light of the different legal traditions.

Comparative public administration has been a recognized field since the 1950's. Some of the most distinguished scholars in the field have written on the problems of transfer of technology from developed to less developed societies. Riggs in 1962 called for a need to employ "ecological" approaches in public administration which recognized the influence of cultural differences on administration of programs.[45] Heady in 1966 described the "system variation" across societies, and the differential functioning of bureaucracies given different cultures and political systems.[46] Wildavsky's works in budgeting analysis in poor and rich countries grew out of the study of public administration.[47] Unsurprisingly, business administration has necessarily paid attention to cultural differences affecting the practice of management for well over a decade.[48]

Comparative politics, or political science has fertilized the field of public administration. Fine work, using system approaches, has elaborated the structure and function of societies. Almond's work is well known in applications of such concepts of interest aggregation and communication, political recruitment, role and policy making, management of feedback, and political productivity in nations at different stages of development.[49] Comparative politics is waiting for application to a comparative politics of education. An issue such as the effects of centralization on decision

making in ministries of education has been studied in depth by Mark Hanson, but requires more attention by scholars.[50] An outstanding book on educational administration in Brazil has extensive treatment of comparative concepts discussed in this paper.[51]

Comparative analysis of structures and functions, whether using systems analysis, Marxist economics, or some other approach yields a depth of understanding to administrative behavior which is needed in the preparation of administrators. Many students of educational administration in the United States are exposed to models and concepts which even in the United States work indifferently. A critical analysis of open education or of career education, for example, would be advantageous for U.S. nationals as well as to foreign students, to the extent that ecological constraints could be viewed, not as peculiarities, but as problems in adoption and implementation.

A CONCEPTUAL BASE FOR COMPARATIVE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

The time is overdue for a comparative approach to the study of educational administration. The economics of education have led the way in comparative analysis, but the focus of those working in the implementation of national and regional education plans has been on the technology of production function and marginal analysis. A new wave of scholars is on the scene calling for the use of public policy to solve questions which only a decade ago were seen in narrow economic terms. The message of the scholars, couched often in Marxist terms, requires thorough examination,

as much of their social message sounds as prescriptive as the old messages of save, economize, and export to survive. The corridor of choices for developing nations is much narrower than for developed nations. Whatever choices are exercised impose much greater burdens on the structure and human beings of developing countries than on those of developed nations. Advice on choices is being shouted at the developing nations along with the darkest predictions of disaster for avoidance of the recommended choices. Since many choices are contradictory, it might be best to ignore the advice. A comparative approach to educational administration can help in reducing the rhetoric of the arguments to a more complete and more focused analysis on the nature and effects of education. A well recognized demonology exists headed by multinational corporations. It is not helpful to cast associations of nations, such as OAS, UNESCO, and the development banks into the same corral; it ignores the assistance of such agencies encouraging the appearance of structural analysis even of the most radical kind.

Several problems are general to developed and developing societies. A cross-national analysis might focus on the nature of these problems in the context of national decision making. Recognizing that poor nations have fewer choices and more constraints, the following problems appear to call for the help of scholars in all concerned nations and international agencies:

1. The nature of schooling and its effects on collectivities and individuals. The varieties of the goals and effects of schooling, no matter how nonformal, are so complex that only small analytic

bites on the problem have been noticeable. Among the questions pertinent to this problem area are whether education should serve economic development ahead of social development and personal development, and what the relative costs of the choices are.

2. Preserving the integrity of peoples' cultures and individual personalities as they are integrated into national system. This problem is present everywhere as nations attempt to bring education to everyone to allow them to improve their well-being and participate in the modern polity. Policies which are designed to extend official languages, while not destroying local or regional languages are a good example. The study of this type of effect has been mainly from the perspective of the top of the structure. Microstudies of the effects at the bottom, on the communities, are desparately needed, quickly, in order to allow people any shred of influence over the program of education.
3. The possibility of rebuilding the viability of rural areas. Food production, land holding and reform, the health of the economy, the availability of credit, the presence of socio-political infrastructure including schooling, the perceived qualities of life in urban and rural areas and political objectives all interact in what is a worldwide crisis. Whatever has been done to assist national development and international trade appears to have contributed to the downward spiral of rural and small town life. Urbanization in all countries appears to be almost uncontrollable.

4. The role of education in national development is an aspect closely related to the preceding problem. The emphasis of education for job and meeting economic objectives appears to be related to a weakening of traditional culture, rural social structure and even traditional national values in many instances. Maintaining a balance between satisfaction of macroeconomic and social objectives requires a fine tuning which no nation has demonstrated, no matter how developed. Another aspect of this problem is striking a balance between academic and noneducational objectives in a world which increasingly ascribes highest value onto some kind of professionalism.
5. Making government responsive to people is a universal problem. Educational bureaucracies are marked by the same pathologies of those in other sectors. The reformation of bureaucracies to become at once humane and efficient would appear to be a staggering task. Empirical and theoretical work on bureaucracies has been grounded on description of pathologies and observation of growth variables. Not enough cross-national work on effective and humane bureaucracies has been published to allow concepts of reform and redirection to surface.
6. Models of change including change agent roles, and adoption-diffusion processes need redefinition. Whatever information this research has provided has been at the client end of the relationship. The research has not enlightened us as to the impact on

the change agents. When clients reject the message or model, what has the change agent learned as a result? One-way analyses are no longer helpful, as they told us little about the change agent's or institution's goals. What have the Ford and Rockefeller foundations learned, and how have they changed themselves, as a result of the massive and explicit rejection of their population control propaganda by much of the third world? When the change agent sees the social wreckage in rural areas of the world directly traceable to the agency' own intervention, what does the agency do? What conclusions have the educational development people drawn from the apparent dysfunctions of concepts, such as experimental laboratory schools, in developing nations? Does feedback exist only in textbooks on organizations? Do development organizations have memories, and if so of what kind concerning adoptions and rejections? The consultation process in developing nations offers a fertile field for analysis of a post-audit type, using widely heralded innovations of the 1960's as an example. Without a searching analysis of the feedback process in change processes, the development organizations will continue to attempt to export their own failures.

The roles of administrators in policy making can be studied in conjunction with the foregoing inquiries. Administrators have to examine their own efficacy, their own goal directions vis-à-vis national and international goals, their own roles and values as interventors to achieve social goals or to preserve existing social structures. Administrators' training and socialization processes have been widely perceived as forming a value-

neutral corps of technocrats. This assumption, however, appears to be more true for developed countries with high economic and political resource redundancy. The function of administrators in reform needs examination, as well as the role shift from training ground to operational area as the new administrator applies concepts. The administrator who must assume political leadership and a value position vis-à-vis reform is not prepared in the classical Weberian sense for such behavior. This stress between the contrasting ideal of neutrality in the training program in a developed country, and the need for exercising leadership for reform in the trainees own developing nation needs attention. "Trained incapacity," "socialization for neutrality" are concepts which only name the problem, but do not describe the dynamics.

TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

The study of educational administration in the eighth decade of this century has available a variety of tools for analysis as a result of the multiplication of interests and skills since 1960. A recent recognizable interest in educational administration is the application of philosophical analysis to organization theory. Some school administrators in the 19th century were quite comfortable in, and exhibited competence in philosophical discussions about education. The works of Barnard are an example. A recognized strength of Latin American and European administrators trained in universities is the study of philosophy and the humanities. Hence, a cross-national study using philosophical analysis is possible.

Possible directions for a cross-national inquiry would be a study of philosophical views of organizations. A variety of philosophical views of organization exists at any one time within a given organization. The

shifts in philosophical views should be predictive or reflective of social goals within that society.

Societies embrace a variety of philosophical positions for different types of organizations. One nation might have a court system with a pragmatic philosophical position, shifting to existential or positivist positions. Another nation's court system having held a positivist-oriented legal system may be shifting to a rationalist orientation.

Philosophical views of schooling shift within nations from essentialist-humanist to pragmatic-instrumental. Social philosophy is a most important indicator of social change. Shifts in orientation from rationalist-positivist orientation to emphasis on Marxist orientation are not uncommon and are related to a nation's planning strategy and economic choices.

Widely shared philosophical positions are a property at first of intellectual and administrative elites, but cannot be held independently of a society's ethos. Concern for poverty, a will to using the state and its school system as instruments of reform, are expressions of philosophical shifts away from essentialist-oriented hierarchically ordered views of society. The revolution in expectations of the state's economy and society described in the review earlier in this paper are philosophically based. The philosophical bases of the positions on the state's relation to the person need fuller description as it underlies any description of the role of schooling and its desired effects.

Technicians, including administrators, must work with what are supposed to be culture-free technologies. They are trained not to perform in

particular cultural settings, but in generalized settings, which ignore the receptivity of the clients' culture. This administration mythology has come to grief many times, most recently in Iran. Administrators view themselves as scientists, effective regardless of the cultural setting. Clients are passive recipients of administrative technology only to a point, and administrators have yet to discover what that point is. Do clients offer resistance or take revenge against generalized technology when it is realized that the cultural ground shifts too quickly and radically for the clients' well being. That question is not helpful, but that it must be asked illustrates the little that is known about the limits of administrator effectiveness.

Adoption of innovation sponsored by change agents is positively related to the "modernism" tendencies of the adopters and their identification with adopters. This sums up the state of knowledge of the adoption literature.[52] What this says is that the more modern the clients, the more apt they are to adopt sponsored innovation. Which is not an optimistic prediction of administrator effectiveness. Needless to say we need to know far more about the interaction between culture and scientific administration.

The predictions offered concerning the effectiveness of administrators are based on research done in developed societies in which clients and administrators negotiate far more as equals than is the case in developing nations. In the latter, a deep human wisdom (termed "resistance" in the change literature) rests in folk, unscientific, intuitive knowledge learned by socialization to cultural norms.

Modern nations in the process of development are fragile entities. The more quickly they attempt to enter the international economic system, the more risks they take, due to the conflict with deeply held cultural norms of their societies. The higher and faster the rewards are offered by the international system to a developing traditional nation, the more cultural and economic shocks are delivered to the nation. Administrators are confronted with the dilemma of seeking greater short-term economic gain to solve severe social imbalances, but in accepting excessively high rewards, the nation's capability to absorb or administer modern monetary rewards is strained, possibly to the breaking point. Rational and optimal decisions for one society may be disruptive and irrational for another. Optimality is not a generalized variable. It is an elusive end of administration, resisting formulae. Administration only parades as a science if it does not know or come to terms with its cultural imperatives.

NOTES

1. Nicholas Hans, Comparative Education, A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions (London: Routledge and Kegen Paul, Ltd., 1958, 3d edition).

2. Marc-Antoine Julien, "L'Esquisse et Vues Préliminaires d'un Ouvrage Sur L'Education Compareé, 1817," Nicholas Hans, op. cit.: 1.

3. T. W. Schultz, "Investment in Human Capital," American Economic Review 51(1, 1978):1-17.

4. Henry Edwin Dwight, "Education in Prussia and the United States: Descriptions and Contrasts," A History of International and Comparative Education, eds. Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman (Glenview, Ill.: Scott-Foresman & Co., 1968):74.

5. William Channing Woodbridge, "Comparative State of Instruction in the United States and in Europe," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.:80-86.

6. Horace Mann, Editorial, The Common School Journal 6(1844):2-12.

7. James Russell Parsons, "Prussian Schools Through American Eyes," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 246-256.

8. Ibid.: 247.

9. J. Fraser, "An Official English Report on Ameican Education," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 333-337.

10. Ferdinand Edward Buisson, "French Views of American Schools," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 367-376.

11. R. Laishley, "Comparative Educational Charts and Notes on Education in the United States," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 381-396.

12. Emil Hausknecht, "German Criticism of American Education," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 424-430.

13. E. F. McCarthy, "The United States and English Systems Compared," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 430-444.

14. R. E. Hughes, "Halfway Education: Britain Between German and America," Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, op. cit.: 460-473.

15. "Secondary Instruction in Scotland," American Journal of Education 22(1871):453-512.

16. "Public Instruction in Belgium," American Journal of Education 22(1871):385-400.

17. International Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers' College, ed. I. L. Kandel, (New York: Columbia Univ. Press).

18. Theodore L. Reller and Edgar L. Morphet, Comparative Educational Administration (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962).

19. Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson, and Bruce Westley, The Dynamics of Learned Change (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958).

20. An early work was George M. Beal and others, "Validity of the Concept of Stages in the Adoption Process," Rural Sociology 22(1957):166-168.

21. See Ernest Feder, The Rape of the Peasantry: Latin America's Landholding System (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday Anchor Books, 1971). See also Andre Gunder Frank and Arturo Bonilla, "Declaration of Latin American Economists," Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday Anchor Press, 1972).

22. Peasants, Power and Applied Social Change: Vicos as a Model, eds. Henry F. Dobyns, Paul L. Doughty and Harold D. Lasswell (Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1964, 1971).

23. Paul Bairoch, translated by Cynthia Postan, The Economic Development of the Third World Since 1900 (Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1975):126-134.

24. Naomi Caiden and Aaron Wildavsky, Planning and Budgeting in Poor Countries (New York: Wiley Interscience Publications, 1974):9.

25. Analytical Models in Educational Planning and Administration, ed. Hector Correa (New York, David McKay Co., 1975).

26. Samuel Bowles, Planning Educational Systems For Economic Growth (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1969).

27. Ibid: 7.

28. Manzoor Ahmed, The Economics of Nonformal Education (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975).

29. Naomi Caiden and Aaron Wildavsky, op. cit. See also Aaron Wildavsky, Budgeting, A Comparative Theory of Budgetary Processes (Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1975).

30. George L. Beckford, Persistent Poverty: Underdevelopment in Plantation Economies of the Third World (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972).

31. Rene Dumont, translated by Vivienne Menkes, Utopia or Else (New York: Universe Books, 1975); See also Pierre Jalee, translated by Mary Klopper, The Pillage of the Third World (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968).

32. Philip Coombs, The World Education Crisis (New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1968).

33. Martin Carnoy, "International Educational Reform: The Ideology of Efficiency," The Limits of Educational Reform, eds. Martin Carnoy and Henry M. Levin (New York: David McKay Co., 1976).

34. Donald J. Willower, "Ideology and Science in Organization Theory," Presented at San Francisco annual meeting, American Educational Research Assn., 1979.

35. Andre Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," Dependence and Underdevelopment Latin America's Political Economy, eds. James Cockcroft, Andre Gunder Frank and Dale L. Johnson (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1972).

36. Henry M. Levin, "Educatonal Reform: Its Meaning?" eds. Martin Carnoy and Henry M. Levin, op. cit.

37. P. Baran, The Political Economy of Growth (New York: The Monthly Review Press, 1957).

38. The model is described in "Editors' Introduction," The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa, eds. Peter C. W. Gutkind and Immanuel Wallerstein (Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1976).

39. See Eds. Philip G. Altbach and Gail P. Kelly, Education and Colonialism (New York: Longman, Inc., 1978) for some applications of this approach. See also Martin Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism (New York: David McKay Co., 1974).

40. Paolo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970).

41. See William F. Pinar, "Notes on the Currciulum Field, 1978," Educational Researcher 7(September 1978):5-12.

42. "Foreword," L. C. Comber and John P. Keeves, Science Education in Nineteen Countries, An Empirical Study (New York: John Wiley, Halsted Press, 1973).

43. Alex Inkeles and David H. Smith, Becoming Modern: Individual Change In Six Developing Countries (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press: 1974).

44. See William Seagle, The Quest for Law (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941); John Henry Merryman, The Civil Law Tradition (Stanford, Calif., Stanford Univ. Press, 1969); Luis Sanchez Agesta, Curso de Derecho Constucional Comparado (Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1965).

45. Fred W. Riggs, Convergences in the Study of Comparative Public Administration and Local Government (University of Florida, Studies in Public Administration No. 23, Public Administration Clearing Service, 1962).

46. Ferrel Heady, Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966).

47. Naomi Caiden and Aaron Wildavsky, op. cit.

48. An example of a text in the field is Stanley M. Davis, Comparative Management: Organizational and Cultural Perspectives, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971).

49. Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., Comparative Politics: System, Process, and Policy (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1966. Second edition, 1978). See also Kay Lawson, The Comparative Study of Political Parties (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976); and Mark W. Hagopian, Regimes, Movements, and Ideologies: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science (New York: Longman, Inc., 1978).

50. See E. Mark Hanson, "Field Research Methodology and the Study of Latin American Ministries of Education," Presented at San Francisco Annual Meeting, American Education Research Association, 1979; Mark Hanson, "Reform and Regionalization in the Venezuelan Ministry of Education," Educational Alternatives in Latin America, ed. Thomas J. LaBelle (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publication, 1975).

51. Benno Sander, Educacao Brasilera: Valores Formais E Valores Reais (Sao Paolo: Livreria Pioneira Editora, 1977).

52. Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach (New York: The Free Press, 1971).